

REMARKS

The disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities. Responsive to this, the specification is corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Moreover, Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lieser (4,404,874), and Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Hu (6,260,446).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 5 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior arts cited by the Examiner. It is believed that the amended claim 1 has disclosed a structure whose construction and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior arts. Therefore, it is believed that, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) should be removed, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted the amended claims 2-4 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KUO-CHEN LIU

BY: PHILLIP LIU

(CUSTOMER 48819)